

July 19 2010

ORIGINALEd Smith
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF MONTANA

IN The Supreme Court of The State of MONTANA
No's DA 09-0556 and DA 09-0605

STATE OF MONTANA
Appellee

v.
Dawnie Mack Sellers
Appellant

FILED

JUL 19 2010

Ed Smith
CLERK OF THE SUPREME COURT
STATE OF MONTANA

(MOTION TO DISMISS ALL ATTORNEYS, AND TO
SET ASIDE ORAL ARGUMENTS OF 4-21-10 AS MOOT)

Comes now Appellant, and petitions this court

for cause to immediately remove all attorneys from
this cause, and to set aside the oral arguments

conducted in this cause on 4-21-10, for the issue of
such arguments is now moot, as listed below.

As neither OAC, nor the OAC Hand Picked Attorney Friend
(Colin ~~to~~ Stephens) that OAC Picked to argue against
them in this court on 4-21-10 has been willing to

communicate in any manner, or form with appellant
since the oral arguments was conducted.

B. The OAD's insistence now before this court of
allegations claiming separate firms of OSPD and OAD
is ludicrous, and in fairness the court should note in
(OAD Handpicked claim Stephens motion to remove OAD)
attorney Stephens admits he does act in a contract
and conflict capacity for the OSPD and OAD on
occasion, see Petition to remove OAD, Page 2, Para. Top.

see further in OAD's response Brief, MS.

HUNT alleges that contract attorneys have a
greater quantifiable financial and loyalty stake in
shying away from claims against Regional attorneys
because OAD contract work provides a significant
part of some contract attorneys livelihood see Response
Brief to appellant's Petition to remove OAD, Page 15,
Lower para.

C. This shows ATTORNEY STEPHENS is AFFILIATED WITH THE OAD THROUGH CONTRACT, AND SINCE OAD'S GAME OF ORAL ARGUMENTS WAS PLAYED OUT ON 4-21-10, EXPLAINS WHY MR STEPHENS HAS NO INTERESTS IN COMMUNICATING WITH APPELLANT IN ANY MANNER REGARDING THIS CASE.

D. THIS FRIENDSHIP (CONTRACT) ARGUMENT SHOWS AN OBVIOUS CONFLICT OF INTEREST IN ITSELF, AND TOTALLY ENTRAPS APPELLANT IN THE LIKENESS OF A (KANGAROO JUDICIAL SYSTEM) BY ORDER OF THIS COURT IN THE FOLLOWING WAYS, TO-WIT:

① OAD ATTORNEY (KONN MEYER) IS ASSIGNED AS APPELLANT'S COUNSEL ~~IN~~ ^{AS} IN THIS CASE, ATTORNEY (COLIN STEPHENS) THE OAD'S HANDICAPPED FRIEND WAS ~~ASSIGNED~~ ^{AS} CHOSEN TO FILE A BRIEF TO REMOVE OAD FROM THIS CASE.

OF WHICH ON 4-21-10 THERE WAS A FRIEND ARGUMENT SHOW BEFORE THIS COURT, AND NEITHER ATTORNEY WILL NOW COMMUNICATE WITH APPELLANT IN ANY MANNER CONCERNING ANYTHING IN THIS CASE.

② APPELLANT HAS DISCOVERED THE ACTUAL TRIAL TRANSCRIPTS IN THIS CASE IS NOT COMPLETE. (A) NEITHER ATTORNEY WILL COMMUNICATE WITH APPELLANT BY VISIT, TELEPHONE, OR THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE (B) MY AFFIDAVIT "FOR CAUSE" SENT TO THIS COURT WAS REJECTED BY THE MONTANA SUPREME COURT CLERK, UNDER THE PRETENSE THAT I AM SUPPOSED TO WORK THROUGH THE ASSIGNED COUNSEL. (C) COPIES OF SAID AFFIDAVIT WAS SERVED ON ALL

Parties, including the Twenty First Judicial District Court stenographer that produced such doctored transcripts, see Affidavit Attached, for filing.

CONCLUSION

The state of mentions failure to provide appellant an attorney that could possibly communicate with appellant in regards to issues and time frames of issues in an appeal, to safeguard such legal issues in the judicial system is unconstitutional.

It is even more unconstitutional when a court entraps an appellant by forcing him to have attorneys assigned to his case that has no interest in appellants behalf of the cause, and no interest in communicating with appellant in any manner, this in itself is suppression under the color of law, to hide state crimes & corruption that riddle such entities such as OSPD.

I'm asking this court to remove these state pretenders from this cause today, and set aside all activities, even their friendship argument of 4-21-10 as being moot. For moot it is, no public pretender needs to be on this cause. (All parties were served on this issue, and no party responded or refuted to this issue under law) ^{Dismiss.}

Appellate expects OAD to claim appellant is hard to communicate. Such liars are expected to come up with such games. The record will show in

appellants History he has never requested any assigned
counsel be removed, for they were Attorneys, not Libs
in a state of corruption.

Respectfully
Submitted
Donni mercer Bell

Appellant, pro-se

7-14-10

Certificate of Service

I declare under the penalty of Perjury that I served
a copy of this (motion to dismiss all Attorneys & set aside
the oral arguments of 4-21-10) on this 16th day of July, 2010,
by U.S. mail, postage prepaid and address to:

ATTY. GEN. OF MT.
Steve Bullock
215 N. Spuders
P.O. Box 201401
Helena, MT. - 59620-1401

George Cora
205 Bedford St.
Hamilton, MT. - 59840

Koon Mercer (ORD)
P.O. Box 750145
Helena, MT. - 59620

Colin Mc Stephens
315 West Pine St.
P.O. Box 7337
Missoula, MT. - 59807

c.c. appellant